arXiv:1601.07403v1 [cs.LO] 9 Jan 2016

Graphs of finite algebras, edges, and connectivity

Andrei A. Bulatov

Abstract

We refine and advance the study of the local structure of idempotent finite algebras started in [A.Bulatov, *The Graph of a Relational Structure and Constraint Satisfaction Problems*, LICS, 2004]. We introduce a graph-like structure on an arbitrary finite idempotent algebra omitting type **1**. We show that this graph is connected, its edges can be classified into 3 types corresponding to the local behavior (semilattice, majority, or affine) of certain term operations, and that the structure of the algebra can be 'improved' without introducing type **1** by choosing an appropriate reduct of the original algebra. Then we refine this structure demonstrating that the edges of the graph of an algebra can be made 'thin', that is, there are term operations that behave very similar to semilattice, majority, or affine operations on 2-element subsets of the algebra. Finally, we prove certain connectivity properties of the refined structures.

This research is motivated by the study of the Constraint Satisfaction Problem, although the problem itself does not really show up in this paper.

1 Introduction

The study of the Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP) and especially the Dichotomy Conjecture triggered a wave of research in universal algebra, as it turns out that the algebraic approach to the CSP developed in [15, 20] is the most prolific one in this area. These developments have led to a number of strong results about the CSP, see, e.g., [1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 19]. However, successful application of the algebraic approach also requires new results about the structure of finite algebras. Two ways to describe this structure have been proposed. One is based on absorption properties [2, 3] and has led not only to new results on the CSP, but also to significant developments in universal algebra itself.

In this paper we refine and advance the alternative approach originally developed in [7, 11, 16], which is based on the local structure of finite algebras. This approach identifies subalgebras or factors of an algebra having 'good' term operations, that is, operations of one of the three types: semilattice, majority, or affine. It

then explores the graph or hypergraph formed by such subalgebras, and exploits its connectivity properties. In a nutshell, this method stems from the early study of the CSP over so called conservative algebras [10], and has led to a much simpler proof of the dichotomy conjecture for conservative algebras [13] and to a characterization of CSPs solvable by consistency algorithms [9]. In spite of these applications the original methods suffers from a number of drawbacks that make its use difficult. In the present paper we refine many of the constructions and fix the deficiencies of the original method. As in [7, 16] an edge is a pair of elements a, b such that there is a factor algebra of the subalgebra generated by a, b that has an operation which is semilattice, majority, or affine on the blocks containing a, b; this operation determines the type of edge ab. In this paper we allow edges to have more than one type if there are several factors witnessing different types. The main difference from the previous results is the introduction of oriented *thin* majority and afiine edges. An edge ab is said to thin if there is a term operation that is semilattice on $\{a, b\}$, or there is a term operation that satisfies the identities of a majority or affine term (say, in variables x, y) on $\{a, b\}$, but only when $x = a$ and $y = b$. Oriented thin edges allow us to prove a stronger version of the connectivity of the graph related to an algbera. This updated approach makes it possible to give a much simpler proof of the result of [9] (see also [4]), however, this is a subject of subsequent papers.

2 Preliminaries

In terminology and notation we follow the standard texts on universal algebra [17, 22]. We also assume familiarity with the basics of the tame congruence theory [18]. All algebras in this paper are assumed to be finite, idempotent, and omitting type **1**.

Algebras will be denoted by $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}$, etc. The subalgebra of an algebra $\mathbb{A}$ generated by a set $B \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ is denoted $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathbb{A}}(B)$, or if $\mathbb{A}$ is clear from the context simply by $\mathsf{Sg}(B)$. The set of term operations of algebra $\mathbb{A}$ is denoted by $\mathsf{Term}(\mathbb{A})$. Subalgebras of direct products are often considered as relations. An element (a tuple) of $\mathbb{A}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{A}_n$ is denoted in boldface, say, $\mathbf{a}$, and its ith component is referred to as $\mathbf{a}[i]$, that is, $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{a}[1], \dots, \mathbf{a}[n])$. The set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ will be denoted by $[n]$. For $I \subseteq [n]$, say, $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, $i_1 < \cdots < i_k$, by $\mathrm{pr}_I\mathbf{a}$ we denote the k-tuple $(\mathbf{a}[i_1], \dots, \mathbf{a}[i_k])$, and for $R \subseteq \mathbb{A}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{A}_n$ by $\mathrm{pr}_I R$ we denote the set $\{\mathrm{pr}_I\mathbf{a} \mid \mathbf{a} \in R\}$. If $I = \{i\}$ or $I = \{i, j\}$ we write $\mathrm{pr}_i, \mathrm{pr}_{ij}$ rather than pr_I. The tuple $\mathrm{pr}_I\mathbf{a}$ and relation $\mathrm{pr}_I R$ are called the *projections* of $\mathbf{a}$ and R on I. A subalgebra (a relation) R of $\mathbb{A}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{A}_n$ is said to be a *subdirect product* of $\mathbb{A}_1, \dots, \mathbb{A}_n$ if $\mathrm{pr}_i R = \mathbb{A}_i$ for every $i \in [n]$. For a congruence α of $\mathbb{A}$ and $a \in \mathbb{A}$, by a^α we denote the α-block containing a, and by $\mathbb{A}/\alpha$ the factor algebra modulo



Figure 1: Edges and thick edges

α. For $B \subseteq \mathbb{A}^2$, the congruence generated by B will be denoted by $\mathsf{Cg}_{\mathbb{A}}(B)$ or just $\mathsf{Cg}(B)$. By $\underline{0}_{\mathbb{A}}, \underline{1}_{\mathbb{A}}$ we denote the least (i.e. the equality relation), and the greatest (i.e. the total relation) congruence of $\mathbb{A}$, respectively. Again, we often simplify this notation to $\underline{0}, \underline{1}$.

3 Graph: Thick edges

3.1 The three types of edges

Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an algebra with universe A. We introduce graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ as follows. The vertex set is the set A. A pair ab of vertices is a *edge* if and only if there exists a congruence θ of $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ and a term operation of $\mathbb{A}$ such that either $f/_\theta$ is an affine operation on $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b)/_\theta$, or $f/_\theta$ is a semilattice operation on $\{a^\theta, b^\theta\}$, or $f/_\theta$ is a majority operation on $\{a^\theta, b^\theta\}$.

If there exists a congruence and a term operation of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $f/_\theta$ is a semilattice operation on $\{a^\theta, b^\theta\}$ then ab is said to have the *semilattice type*. An edge ab is of *majority type* if there are a congruence θ and $f \in \mathsf{Term}(\mathbb{A})$ (a term operation of $\mathbb{A}$, respectively) such that $f/_\theta$ is a majority operation on $\{a^\theta, b^\theta\}$. Finally, ab has the *affine type* if there are a congruence θ and $f \in \mathsf{Term}(\mathbb{A})$ (a term operation of $\mathbb{A}$, respectively) such that $f/_\theta$ is an affine operation on $\langle a, b\rangle/_\theta$. In all cases we say that congruence θ *witnesses* the type of edge ab.

Note that, for every edge ab of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$, there is the associated pair a^θ, b^θ from the factor structure. We will need both of these types of pairs and will sometimes call a^θ, b^θ a *thick* edge (see Fig. 1). The smallest congruence certifying the type of an edge ab will be denoted by θ_{ab}.

Note also that a pair ab may have more than one type witnessed by different congruences θ. Sometimes we need a stricter version of type. A pair ab is *strictly semilattice* if it is semilattice; ab is said to be *strictly majority*, if it is majority but not semilattice. Finally, pair ab is said to be *strictly affine* if it is affine, but not semilattice or majority.

3.2 General connectivity

Theorem 1 *If an idempotent algebra $\mathbb{A}$ omits type* **1***, then $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B})$ is connected for every subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}$.*

Let $\mathbb{A} = (A; F)$ be an idempotent algebra. Recall that a *tolerance* of $\mathbb{A}$ is a binary reflexive and symmetric relation compatible with $\mathbb{A}$. The transitive closure of a tolerance is a congruence of $\mathbb{A}$. In particular, if $\mathbb{A}$ is simple then the transitive closure of every its tolerance different from the equality relation is the total relation. If a tolerance satisfies this condition then we say that it is *connected*. Let τ be a tolerance. A set $B \subseteq A$ maximal with respect of inclusion and such that $B^2 \subseteq \tau$ is said to be a *class* of τ. We will need the following simple observation.

Lemma 2 *Every class of a tolerance of an idempotent algebra is a subalgebra.*

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph. A *path* in G is sequence $H_1, \dots, H_k$ of hyperedges such that $H_i \cap H_{i+1} \neq \varnothing$, for $1 \leq i < k$. The hypergraph G is said to be *connected* if, for any $a, b \in V$, there is a path $H_1, \dots, H_k$ such that $a \in H_1$, $b \in H_k$.

Clearly, the universe of an algebra $\mathbb{A}$ along with the family of all its proper subalgebras forms a hypergraph denoted by $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{A})$. Lemma 2 implies that, for a simple idempotent algebra $\mathbb{A}$, the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{A})$ is connected unless $\mathbb{A}$ is tolerance free. In the latter case it can be disconnected.

If α is a congruence of a finite algebra $\mathbb{A}$ and R is a compatible binary relation, then the *α-closure* of R is defined to be $\alpha \circ R \circ \alpha$. A relation equal to its α-closure is said to be *α-closed*. If (α, β) is a prime quotient of $\mathbb{A}$, then the *basic tolerance for* (α, β) (see [18], Chapter 5) is the α-closure of the relation $\alpha \cup \bigcup\{N^2 \mid N$ is an (α, β)-trace$\}$ if $\mathsf{typ}(\alpha, \beta) \in \{\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{3}\}$, and it is the α-closure of the compatible relation generated by $\alpha \cup \bigcup\{N^2 \mid N$ is an (α, β)-trace$\}$ if $\mathsf{typ}(\alpha, \beta) \in \{\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5}\}$. The basic tolerance is the smallest α-closed tolerance τ of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $\alpha \neq \tau \subseteq \beta$.

Let (α, β) is a prime quotient of $\mathbb{A}$. An *(α, β)-quasi-order* is a compatible reflexive and transitive relation R such that $R \cap R^{-1} = \alpha$, and the transitive closure of $R \cup R^{-1}$ is β. The quotient (α, β) is said to be *orderable* if there exists an (α, β)-quasi-order. By Theorem 5.26 of [18], (α, β) is orderable if and only if $\mathsf{typ}(\alpha, \beta) \in \{\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5}\}$.

Recall that an element a of an algebra $\mathbb{A}$ is said to be *absorbing* if whenever $t(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is an $(n+1)$-ary term operation of $\mathbb{A}$ such that t depends on x and $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in A^n$, then $t(a, b_1, \dots, b_n) = a$. A congruence θ of $\mathbb{A}^2$ is said to be *skew* if it is the kernel of no projection mapping of $\mathbb{A}^2$ onto its factors. If $\mathbb{A}$ is a simple idempotent algebra, then the result of [21] states that one of the following holds: (a) $\mathbb{A}$ is term equivalent to a module; (b) $\mathbb{A}$ has an absorbing element; or (c) $\mathbb{A}^2$ has no skew congruence.

We also need the following easy observation.

Lemma 3 *Let R be an n-ary compatible relation on $\mathbb{A}$ such that, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\mathrm{pr}_i R = \mathbb{A}$. Then, for any $i \in [n]$, the relation $\mathsf{tol}_i = \{(a, b) \mid$ there are $a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n)$, $(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \in R\}$ is a tolerance of $\mathbb{A}$.*

Tolerance of the form tol_i will be called *link tolerance*, or *ith link tolerance*

Proposition 4 *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a simple idempotent algebra.*

(1) If $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{A}) \in \{\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5}\}$ then $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{A})$ is connected.

(2) If $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{A}) = \mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbb{A}$ has a proper tolerance, then $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{A})$ is connected.

(3) If $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{A}) = \mathbf{2}$ then $\mathbb{A}$ is term equivalent to a module.

(4) If $\mathbb{A} = \mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$, $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{A}) = \mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbb{A}$ is tolerance free, then either a, b are connected in $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{A})$, or there is a binary term operation f or a ternary term operation g such that f is a semilattice operation on $\{a, b\}$, or g is a majority operation on $\{a, b\}$.

Proof: (1) By Theorem 5.26 of [18], there exists $(\underline{0}, \underline{1})$-quasi-order $\leq$ on $\mathbb{A}$, which is, clearly, just a compatible partial order. Let $a \leq b \in A$ be such that $a \leq c \leq b$ implies $c = a$ or $c = b$. We claim that $\{a, b\}$ is a subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}$. Indeed, for any term operation $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of $\mathbb{A}$ and any $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{a, b\}$, we have $a = f(a, \dots, a) \leq f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq f(b, \dots, b) = b$. Finally, it follows from Lemma 5.24(3) and Theorem 5.26(2) that $\leq$ is connected.

(2) Follows straightforwardly from Lemma 2 and the fact that the transitive closure of any proper tolerance of $\mathbb{A}$ is the total relation.

(3) Follows from the results of [21].

(4) We consider two cases.

CASE 1. There is no automorphism φ of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $\varphi(a) = b$ and $\varphi(b) = a$.

Consider the relation R generated by $(a, b), (b, a)$. By the assumption made, R is not the graph of a bijective mapping. By Lemma 3, $\mathsf{tol}_1, \mathsf{tol}_2$ are tolerances of $\mathbb{A}$ different from the equality relation. Thus, they are the total relation. Therefore, there is $c \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $(a, c), (b, c) \in R$. If both $\mathsf{Sg}(a, c), \mathsf{Sg}(b, c)$ are proper subalgebras of $\mathbb{A}$, then a, b are connected in $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{A})$. Otherwise, let, say, $\mathsf{Sg}(a, c) = \mathbb{A}$. Since $(b, a), (b, c) \in R$ and $\mathbb{A}$ is idempotent, $(b, d) \in R$ for any $d \in \mathbb{A}$. In particular, $(b, b) \in R$. This means that there is a binary term operation f such that $f(a, b) = f(b, a) = b$, as required.

CASE 2. There is an automorphism φ of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $\varphi(a) = b$ and $\varphi(b) = a$.

Consider the ternary relation R generated by $(a, a, b), (a, b, a), (b, a, a)$. As in the previous case, if we show that $(a, a, a) \in R$, then the result follows. Let also $S = \{(c, \varphi(c)) \mid c \in \mathbb{A}\}$ denotes the graph of an automorphism φ with $\varphi(a) = b$ and $\varphi(b) = a$.

CLAIM 1. $\mathrm{pr}_{1,2}R = \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A}$.

Let $Q = \mathrm{pr}_{1,2}R$ and $Q' = \{(c, \varphi(d)) \mid (c, d) \in Q\}$. Since $Q'(x, y) = \exists z(Q(x, z) \wedge S(z, y))$, this relation is compatible. Clearly, $Q = \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A}$ if and only if $Q' = \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{A}$. Notice that $(a, a), (b, b), (a, b) \in Q'$. Since $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{A}) = \mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbb{A}$ is tolerance free, every pair $c, d \in \mathbb{A}$ is a trace. Therefore, there is a polynomial operation $g(x)$ with $g(a) = c, g(b) = d$ and, hence, there is a term operation $f(x, y, z)$ such that $f(a, b, x) = g(x)$. For this operation we have

$$f\left(\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix} \in Q'.$$

Next we show that tol_3 cannot be the equality relation. Suppose for contradiction that it is. Then the relation $\theta = \{((c_1, d_1), (c_2, d_2)) \mid \text{there is } e \in \mathbb{A} \text{ such that } (c_1, d_1, e), (c_2, d_2, e) \in R\}$ is a congruence of $Q = \mathbb{A}^2$. It cannot be a skew congruence, hence, it is kernel of the projection of $\mathbb{A}^2$ onto one of its factors. Without loss of generality let $\theta = \{((c_1, d_1), (c_2, d_2)) \mid c_1 = c_2\}$. This means that, for any $e \in \mathbb{A}$ and any $(c_1, d_1, e), (c_2, d_2, e) \in R$, we have $c_1 = c_2$. However, $(a, b, a), (b, a, a) \in R$, a contradiction. The same argument applies when $\theta = \{((c_1, d_1), (c_2, d_2)) \mid d_1 = d_2\}$.

Thus, tol_3 is the total relation, and there is $(c, d) \in Q$ such that $(c, d, a), (c, d, b) \in R$ which implies $\{(c, d)\} \times \mathbb{A} \subseteq R$.

CLAIM 2. For any $(c', d') \in \mathrm{pr}_{1,2}R$, the tuple $(c', d', a) \in R$.

Take a term operation $g(x, y, z)$ such that $g(a, b, c) = c'$ and $g(a, b, \varphi^{-1}(d)) = \varphi^{-1}(d')$. Such an operation exists whenever $c \neq \varphi^{-1}(d)$, because every pair of

elements of $\mathbb{A}$ is a trace. Then

$$g\left(\begin{pmatrix}a\\b\\a\end{pmatrix},\begin{pmatrix}b\\a\\a\end{pmatrix},\begin{pmatrix}c\\d\\a\end{pmatrix}\right)=\begin{pmatrix}g(a,b,c)\\g(b,a,d)\\a\end{pmatrix}$$
$$=\begin{pmatrix}c'\\\varphi(g(\varphi^{-1}(b),\varphi^{-1}(a),\varphi^{-1}(d)\\a\end{pmatrix}$$
$$=\begin{pmatrix}c'\\\varphi(g(a,b,\varphi^{-1}(d)\\a\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}c'\\\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(d'))\\a\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}c'\\d'\\a\end{pmatrix}\in R.$$

What is left is to show that there are c, d such that $(c, d, a) \in R$ and $c \neq \varphi^{-1}(d)$. Suppose $c = \varphi^{-1}(d)$. If $\mathsf{Sg}(a, c), \mathsf{Sg}(c, b) \neq \mathbb{A}$, the a, b are connected in $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{A})$. Let $\mathsf{Sg}(a, c) = \mathbb{A}$, and h such that $h(a, c) = b$. Since R is symmetric with respect to any permutation of coordinates, $\{c\} \times \mathbb{A} \times \{d\} \subseteq R$. In particular, $(c, c, d) \in R$. Then

$$h\left(\begin{pmatrix}a\\a\\b\end{pmatrix},\begin{pmatrix}c\\c\\d\end{pmatrix}\right)=\begin{pmatrix}b\\b\\a\end{pmatrix},$$

as $c = \varphi^{-1}(d)$ and $a = \varphi^{-1}(b)$. The tuple (b, b, a) is as required.

Thus, $(a, a, a) \in R$ which means that there is a term operation $f(x, y, z)$ such that $f(a, a, b) = f(a, b, a) = f(b, a, a) = a$. Since φ is an automorphism, we also get $f(b, b, a) = f(b, a, b) = f(a, b, b) = b$, i.e. f is a majority operation on $\{a, b\}$. □

Proof:[Theorem 1] Suppose for contradiction that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ is disconnected. Let $\mathbb{B}$ be a minimal subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B})$ is disconnected. Since the graph of every proper subalgebra of $\mathbb{B}$ is connected, $\mathbb{B}$ is 2-generated, say, $\mathbb{B} = \mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$. Let θ be a maximal congruence of $\mathbb{B}$.

Clearly, if $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B}/_\theta)$ is connected then $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B})$ is connected. Therefore, $\mathbb{B}/_\theta$ is tolerance free and of type **3**. Take $c, d \in \mathbb{B}$; let $c' = c^\theta, d' = d^\theta$. If $\mathsf{Sg}(c, d) \neq \mathbb{B}$ then c, d are connected by the assumption made. Otherwise $\mathsf{Sg}(c', d') = \mathbb{B}/_\theta$. By Proposition 4, either c', d' are connected in $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{B}/_\theta)$ and hence in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B}/_\theta)$, or $c'd'$ is an edge in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B}/_\theta)$. In the former case c, d are connected because every proper subalgebra of $\mathbb{B}/_\theta$ gives rise to a proper subalgebra of $\mathbb{B}$. In the latter case cd is an edge of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B})$. Thus, $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B})$ is connected, a contradiction. □

3.3 Adding thick edges

Generally, an edge, or even a thick edge is not a subalgebra. However, we show that every idempotent algebra $\mathbb{A}$ omitting type **1** has a reduct $\mathbb{A}'$ such that $\mathbb{A}'$ also omits

type one, but every its edge of semilattice or majority type is a subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}'$. Moreover, some type restrictions are also observed. We say that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ is *semilattice* (*semilattice/majority*)*-connected* if every two vertices in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ are connected by a path consisting of semilattice (semilattice and strict majority) edges. For short we will abbreviate it to s-connected and sm-connected.

Theorem 5 *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an idempotent algebra omitting type* **1**, *ab an edge of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ of semilattice or strict majority type, and $R_{ab} = (a^{\theta_{ab}} \cup b^{\theta_{ab}})$ the thick edge ab. Let also F_{ab} denote set of term operations of $\mathbb{A}$ preserving R_{ab}*

(1) $\mathbb{A}' = (A, F_{ab})$ omits type **1**.

(2) If ab is semilattice and $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ is s-connected, then $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A}')$ is s-connected.

(3) If ab is strict majority and $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ is sm-connected, then $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A}')$ is sm-connected.

We prove Theorem 5 by induction on the 'structure' of the algebra. The base case of this induction is given by strictly simple algebras. Recall that a simple algebra whose proper subalgebras are all 1-element is said to be *strictly simple*. We need the description of finite idempotent strictly simple algebras given in [23].

Let G be a permutation group acting on a set A. By $\mathrm{R}(G)$ we denote the set of operations on A preserving each relation of the form $\{(a, g(a)) \mid a \in A\}$ where $g \in G$, and $\mathrm{F}(G)$ denotes the set of idempotent members of $\mathrm{R}(G)$.

Let ${}_K\overline{A} = (A; +, K)$ be a finite dimensional vector space over a finite field K, $T(\overline{A})$ the group of translations $\{x + a \mid a \in A\}$, and $\mathsf{End}\ {}_K\overline{A}$ the endomorphism ring of ${}_K\overline{A}$. Then one can consider $\overline{A}$ as a module over $\mathsf{End}\ {}_K\overline{A}$. This module is denoted by ${}_{(\mathsf{End}\ {}_K\overline{A})}\overline{A}$.

Finally, let F^0_k denote the set of all operations preserving the relation

$$X^0_k = \{(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in A^k \mid a_i = 0 \text{ for at least one } i, \\ 1 \le i \le k\}$$

where 0 is some fixed element of A, and let $\mathrm{F}^0_\omega = \bigcap_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathrm{F}^0_k$.

Theorem 6 ([23]) *A finite strictly simple idempotent algebra $\mathbb{A}$ is term equivalent to one of the following algebras:*

(a) $(A, \mathrm{F}(G))$ for a permutation group G on A such that every nonidentity member of G has at most one fixed point;

(b) $(A, \mathsf{Term}_{\mathrm{id}}({}_{(\mathsf{End}\ {}_K\overline{A})}\overline{A}))$ for some vector space ${}_K\overline{A}$ over a finite field K;

(c) $(A, \mathrm{F}(G) \cap \mathrm{F}^0_k)$ for some k ($2 \le k \le \omega$), some element $0 \in A$ and some permutation group G acting on A such that 0 is the unique fixed point of every nonidentity member of G;

(d) (A, F) where $|A| = 2$ and F contains a semilattice operation;

(e) a two-element algebra with an empty set of basic operations.

It can be easily shown (see e.g. [15]) that in case (c) $\mathbb{A}$ has a term *zero-multiplication* operation, that a binary operation h such that $h(x,y) = 0$ whenever $x \neq y$.

Proof:[of Theorem 5.] Let ab be an edge of semilattice type and f is a term operation such that $f/_{\theta_{ab}}$ is a semilattice operation on $B' = \{a^{\theta_{ab}}, b^{\theta_{ab}}\}$. We will omit index θ_{ab} everywhere it does not lead to a confusion. Let $\mathbb{A}' = (A; F')$ where F' is the set of binary term operations g of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $g/_{\theta_{ab}}$ on B' is either a projection or equals $f/_{\theta_{ab}}$. The subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}$ generated by a set $B \subseteq A$ will be denoted by $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(B)$, while the subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}'$ generated by the same set will be denote by $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(B)$. In general, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(B) \subseteq \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(B)$.

Claim 1. f can be chosen to satisfy the identity $f(x, f(x,y)) = f(x,y)$.

For every $x \in A$, we consider the unary operation $g_x(y) = f(x,y)$. There is a natural number n_x such that $g_x^{n_x}$ is an idempotent transformation of A. Let n be the least common multiple of the n_x, $x \in A$ and

$$h(x,y) = f(\underbrace{x, f(x, \ldots f(x}_{n \text{ times}}, y)\ldots)).$$

Since $g_x^n(y)$ is an idempotent for any $x \in A$, we have $h(x, h(x,y)) = g_x^n(g_x^n(y)) = g_x^n(y) = h(x,y)$. Finally, as is easily seen h equals f on $\{a^{\theta_{ab}}, b^{\theta_{ab}}\}$.

We prove that, for any $c, d \in A$, the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d))$ is connected. Moreover, if for every subalgebra $\mathbb{B}$ of $\mathbb{A}$, $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{B})$ is s-connected, then this holds also for every subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}'$. We proceed by induction on order ideals of $\mathsf{Sub}(\mathbb{A}')$. To prove the base case for induction, suppose that for $c, d \in \mathbb{A}'$, the algebra $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$ is strictly simple. By Theorem 6, we have to consider five cases.

CASE 1.A. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$ is a set.

In this case, $\mathsf{Sg}(c,d) = \{c,d\}$ and $f|_{\{c,d\}}(x,y) = x$. If $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d) \neq \{c,d\}$ then there exists a term operation g of $\mathbb{A}'$ such that $g(c,d) \notin \{c,d\}$. As is easily seen, the operation $g'(x,y) = g(f(x,y), f(y,x))$ equals f on B'; hence, it belongs to F'. However, $g'(c,d) = g(c,d) \notin \{c,d\}$, a contradiction with the assumption made. Thus, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d) = \{c,d\}$.

Then there is a term operation g of $\mathbb{A}$ which is either an affine or majority or semilattice operation on $\{c,d\}$. The operation

$$g'(x,y,z) = g(f(x, f(y,z)), f(y, f(z,x)), f(z, f(x,y)))$$

in the first two cases or $g'(x,y) = g(f(x,y), f(y,x)$ in the latter case belong to F' and is an affine or majority or semilattice operation on $\{c,d\}$ respectively.

CASE 1.B. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d) = \{c,d\}$ is a 2-element semilattice.

There is nothing to prove in this case.

CASE 1.C. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$ is a module.

The operation f on $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$ has the form $f(x,y)=px+(1-p)y$ and either p or $1-p$ is invertible. Suppose that p is invertible and $p^n=1$ for a certain n. Then set

$$f'(x,y)=\underbrace{f(f(\dots f}_{n\text{ times}}(x,y)\dots,y),y).$$

Since f and f' are idempotent, $f'(x,y)=x$ on $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$ and $f'(x,y)=f(x,y)$ on B'.

Then, as in Case 1.A we show that $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)=\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$. Therefore, $\mathbb{B}=\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$ is a strictly simple algebra. If $\mathbb{B}$ is 2-element then we get one of the previous cases. Otherwise, $\mathbb{B}$ either has a zero-multiplication operation h or it is of the form $(B;F(H))$ for a certain permutation group H. In the former case, $h(f(x,y),f(y,x))$ belongs to F' and is a zero-multiplication operation on $\mathbb{B}$. In the latter case, $\mathbb{B}$ has an operation which is either a semilattice or majority operation on $\{c,d\}$. Arguing as above we get an operation of $\mathbb{A}'$ which is semilattice or majority on $\{c,d\}$ respectively.

CASE 1.D. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$ has a zero-multiplication operation h.

Let 0 be the zero-element. Then c,d are connected by edges $c0$ and $d0$.

CASE 1.E. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$ is of the form $(B;F(H))$ for a certain permutation group H. (Note that this algebra has the Boolean type.)

If there is no automorphism φ in H such that $\varphi(c)=d$ and $\varphi(d)=c$, then, by Proposition 4, $\mathbb{A}'$ has a term operation g which is a semilattice operation on $\{c,d\}$. So, let us suppose that there is an automorphism swapping c and d.

If $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$ has no operation which is semilattice on $\{c,d\}$ then we are done. Otherwise, let g be a term operation of $\mathbb{A}$ semilattice on $\{c,d\}$ and h a term operation of $\mathbb{A}'$ majority on $\{c,d\}$. If one of $h(x,x,y),h(x,y,x),h(y,x,x)$ is a semilattice operation on B' then we proceed as before. Otherwise, h is a projection on B'; without loss of generality let it be the first projection. Then $h'(x,y)=f(h(x,y,y),h(y,y,x))$ equals f on B' and is a projection on $\{c,d\}$. We complete the proof as before.

Now, suppose that the claim proved for all proper subalgebras of $\mathbb{C}=\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$. We consider two cases.

CASE 1.1. There is a maximal congruence θ of $\mathbb{C}$ such that $f/_\theta$ is commutative on $\mathbb{C}/_\theta$.

By Claim 1, f is a semilattice operation on $\{c^\theta,f(c^\theta,d^\theta)\}$ and $\{f(c^\theta,d^\theta),d^\theta\}$.

CASE 1.2. The set $D = \{(f(c', d'), f(d', c')) \mid c', d' \in \mathbb{C}\}$ generates the total congruence of $\mathbb{C}$.

If, for every pair $(g(c, d, c''), g(c, d, d''))$, where $(c'', d'') \in D$, and g is a term operation of $\mathbb{C}$, the subalgebra $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(g(c, d, c''), g(c, d, d''))$ of $\mathbb{A}'$ is a proper subalgebra of $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d)$, then $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C})$ is connected and, therefore c, d are connected by induction hypothesis. Indeed, if $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(g(c, d, c''), g(c, d, d'')) = \mathbb{C}$, then $c, d \in \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(g(c, d, c''), g(c, d, d''))$. Therefore, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(g(c, d, c''), g(c, d, d'')) = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d)$.

Suppose that, for a certain $(c', d') \in D$ and a ternary term operation g of $\mathbb{C}$, we have $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(g(c, d, c'), g(c, d, d')) = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d)$. Then, for any $e \in \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d)$, there is a term operation h of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $h(g(c, d, c'), g(c, d, d')) = e$. Consider $h'(x, y, z, t) = h(g(x, y, f(z, t)), g(x, y, f(t, z)))$. We have $h'|_{\{a,b\}}(x, y, z, t) = g(x, y, f(z, t))$, hence, $h' \in F'$. On the other hand, $h'(c, d, c'', d'') = e$, where $f(c', d') = c''$, $f(d', c') = d''$. Thus, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d) = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d)$.

The elements c and d are connected by a path $c = e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k = d$ in G. Thus, it is enough to show that if $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d)$ is connected by edges of semilattice, majority or affine type in G, then so is $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d)$. We may assume cd is an edge. Let θ be a maximal congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d)$ witnessing that it is an edge and θ' a maximal congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d)$ containing θ.

If $\mathbb{B} = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d)/_{\theta'}$ is affine or 2-element we proceed in the same way as in the base case of induction. If $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{B}) \in \{\mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5}\}$ then $c^{\theta'}, d^{\theta'}$ are connected by a chain of 2-element subalgebras, and the result follows from induction hypothesis.

So, suppose that $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{B}) = \mathbf{3}$. If $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{B})$ is connected then we are done by induction hypothesis. Otherwise we use Proposition 4. If there is no automorphism φ of $\mathbb{B}$ such that $\varphi(c^{\theta'}) = d^{\theta'}$ and $\varphi(d^{\theta'}) = c^{\theta'}$, then, by Proposition 4, $\mathbb{A}'$ has a term operation g which is a semilattice operation on $\{c^{\theta'}, d^{\theta'}\}$. So, let us suppose that there is an automorphism swapping $c^{\theta'}$ and $d^{\theta'}$.

If $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d)$ has no operation which is semilattice on $\{c^{\theta'}, d^{\theta'}\}$ then we are done. Otherwise, let g be a term operation of $\mathbb{A}$ semilattice on $\{c^{\theta'}, d^{\theta'}\}$ and h a term operation of $\mathbb{A}'$ majority on $\{c^{\theta'}, d^{\theta'}\}$. If one of $h(x, x, y), h(x, y, x), h(y, x, x)$ is a semilattice operation on B' then we proceed as before. Otherwise, h is a projection on B'; without loss of generality let it be the first projection. Then $h'(x, y) = f(h(x, y, y), h(y, y, x))$ equals f on B' and is a projection on $\{c^{\theta'}, d^{\theta'}\}$. We complete the proof as before.

Now let ab be of majority type and m a term operation such that $m/_{\theta_{ab}}$ is a majority operation on $B' = \{a^{\theta_{ab}}, b^{\theta_{ab}}\}$. Let $\mathbb{A}' = (A; F')$ where F' is the set of binary and ternary term operations g of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $g/_{\theta_{ab}}$ on B' is either a projection or equals $m/_{\theta_{ab}}$. As before, the subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}$ generated by a set $B \subseteq A$ will be denoted by $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(B)$, while the subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}'$ generated by the same set will be denote by $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(B)$. In general, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(B) \subseteq \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(B)$.

Claim 2. m can be chosen to satisfy the identity $m(x, m(x, y, z), m(x, y, z)) = m(x, y, z)$.

For every $x \in A$, we consider the unary operation $g_x(y) = m(x, y, y)$. There is a natural number n_x such that $g_x^{n_x}$ is an idempotent transformation of A. Let n be the least common multiple of the n_x, $x \in A$, and

$$\begin{aligned} h(x, y, z) &= m(\underbrace{x, m(x, \dots m(x}_{n \text{ times}}, y, z), m(x, y, z) \dots)), \\ & \qquad m(x, \dots, y, z), m(x, y, z) \dots))). \end{aligned}$$

Since $g_x^n(y)$ is idempotent for any $x \in A$, we have $h(x, h(x, y, z), h(x, y, z)) = g_x^n(g_x^n(m(x, y, z))) = g_x^n(m(x, y, z)) = h(x, y, z)$. Finally, as is easily seen h is a majority operation on B'.

We proceed by induction on order ideals of $\mathsf{Sub}(\mathbb{A}')$. To prove the base case for induction, suppose that for $c, d \in \mathbb{A}'$, the algebra $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d)$ is strictly simple. By Theorem 6, we have to consider five cases.

CASE 2.A. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d)$ is a set.

In this case, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d) = \{c, d\}$ and $m|_{\{c,d\}}(x, y, z) = x$. If $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d) \neq \{c, d\}$ then there exists a term operation g of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $g(c, d) \notin \{c, d\}$. As is easily seen, the operation $g'(x, y, z) = g(m(x, y, z), m(y, z, x))$ equals m on B'; hence, it belongs to F'. However, $g'(c, d, d) = g(c, d) \notin \{c, d\}$, a contradiction with the assumption made. Thus, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c, d) = \{c, d\}$.

Then there is a term operation g of $\mathbb{A}$ which is either an affine or majority or semilattice operation on $\{c, d\}$. The operation

$$g'(x, y, z) = g(m(x, y, z), m(y, z, x), m(z, x, y))$$

in the first two cases or $g'(x, y) = g(m(x, y, z), m(y, z, x)$ in the latter case belong to F' and is an affine or majority or semilattice operation on $\{c, d\}$ respectively.

CASE 2.B. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d) = \{c, d\}$ is a 2-element semilattice.

There is nothing to prove in this case.

CASE 2.C. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d)$ is a module over a ring K.

The operation m on $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c, d)$ has the form $m(x, y, z) = px + qy + (1 - p - q)z$ and either p or q or $1 - p - q$ is invertible. Suppose that p is invertible and $p^n = 1$ for a certain n. Then set

$$m'(x, y, z, t) = \underbrace{m(m(\dots m}_{n \text{ times}}(x, y, y) \dots, y, y), z, t).$$

We have, $m'(x,y,z,t) = x + (p-1)y + qz + (1-p-q)t$ on $\mathsf{Sg}_{\rm new}(c,d)$ and $m'(x,y,z,t) = m(y,z,t)$ on B'. Let k be the characteristics of the ring K. We set

$$m''(x,y,z,t) = \underbrace{m'(m'(\dots m'}_{k \text{ times}}(x,y,z,t)\dots,y,z,t),y,z,t).$$

For the operation m'' we have $m''(x,y,z,t) = x+k(p-1)y+kqz+k(1-p-q)t = x$ on $\mathsf{Sg}_{\rm new}(c,d)$ and $m''(x,y,z,t) = m(y,z,t)$ on B'.

Then, as in Case 2.A we show that $\mathsf{Sg}_{\rm new}(c,d) = \mathsf{Sg}_{\rm old}(c,d)$ (by substituting $g(m''(x,x,y,z), m''(y,x,y,z))$). Therefore, $\mathbb{B} = \mathsf{Sg}_{\rm old}(c,d)$ is a strictly simple algebra. If $\mathbb{B}$ is 2-element then we get one of the previous cases. Otherwise, $\mathbb{B}$ either has a zero-multiplication operation h or it is of the form $(B;\mathcal{R}(H))$ for a certain permutation group H. In the former case, $h(m''(x,x,y,z), m''(y,x,y,z))$ belongs to F' and is a zero-multiplication operation on $\mathbb{B}$. In the latter case, $\mathbb{B}$ has an operation which is either a semilattice or majority operation on $\{c,d\}$. Arguing as above we get an operation of $\mathbb{A}'$ which is semilattice or majority on $\{c,d\}$ respectively.

CASE 2.D. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\rm new}(c,d)$ has a zero-multiplication operation h.

Let 0 be the zero-element. Then c,d are connected by edges $c0$ and $d0$.

CASE 2.E. $\mathsf{Sg}_{\rm new}(c,d)$ is of the form $(B;\mathcal{R}(H))$ for a certain permutation group H.

If there is no automorphism φ in H such that $\varphi(c) = d$ and $\varphi(d) = c$, then, by Proposition 4, $\mathbb{A}'$ has a term operation g which is a semilattice operation on $\{c,d\}$. So, let us suppose that there is an automorphism swapping c and d.

If $\mathsf{Sg}_{\rm old}(c,d)$ has no operation which is semilattice on $\{c,d\}$ then we are done. Otherwise, let g be a term operation of $\mathbb{A}$ semilattice on $\{c,d\}$ and h a term operation of $\mathbb{A}'$ majority on $\{c,d\}$. If h can be chosen such that it is a majority operation on B' then we proceed as before. Otherwise, h is either a projection or minority or 2/3-minority operation on B'. In the two latter case one of $h(x,y,y), h(y,y,x), h(y,x,y)$ is the first projection on B' and the second projection on $\{c,d\}$; let it be $h(x,y,y)$. Then $h'(x,y,z) = m(h(x,y,y), h(y,y,y), h(z,y,y))$ equals m on B' and is a projection on $\{c,d\}$. We complete the proof as before.

Now, suppose that the claim proved for all proper subalgebras of $\mathbb{C} = \mathsf{Sg}_{\rm new}(c,d)$. We consider two cases.

CASE 2.1. There is a maximal congruence θ of $\mathbb{C}$ such that $m(x,y,y) = m(y,x,y) = m(y,y,x)$ in $\mathbb{C}/_\theta$.

We consider the algebra $\mathbb{B} = \mathsf{Sg}_{\rm new}(c,d)/_\theta$. By the results of [21], $\mathbb{B}$ is either a set or term equivalent to a module or has an absorbing element or $\mathbb{B}^2$ has no skew

congruence. The algebra $\mathbb{B}$ cannot be a set, because m is not a projection on $\mathbb{B}$. If it has an absorbing element, $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{B})$ is connected via the absorbing element. In the last case, if $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{B})$ is connected then the result follows from induction hypothesis. If $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{B})$ is disconnected then, by Proposition 4, there is a term operation f of $\mathbb{B}$ which is either semilattice or majority on $\{c^\theta, d^\theta\}$.

Finally, suppose that $\mathbb{B}$ is term equivalent to module. Then m on $\mathbb{B}$ is of the form $m(x,y,z) = px + qy + rz$. Since $m(x,y,y) = m(y,x,y) = m(y,y,x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} px + (q+r)y &= qx + (p+r)y, \\ px + (q+r)y &= rx + (p+q)y, \\ qx + (p+r)y &= rx + (p+q)y. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(p-q)x = (p-q)y,\ (p-r)x = (p-r)y,\ (q-r)x = (q-r)y.$$

Therefore, $p = q = r$, $m(x,y,z) = px + py + pz$, $3p = 1$ and thus p is invertible. Since m satisfies the identity $m(x, m(x,y,y), m(x,y,y)) = m(x,y,y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m(x, m(x,y,y), m(x,y,y)) &= m(x,y,y) \\ (p + 2p^2)x + 4p^2 y &= px + 2py \\ 2p^2 x + (4p^2 - 2p)y &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $2p^2 = (4p^2 - 2p) = 0$ and hence $2p = 0$. Comparing this with the equality $3p = 1$ we conclude that the Abelian group of $\mathbb{B}$ has period 2, and $m(x,y,z)$ is the minority operation $x + y + z$.

As is easily seen, $h(x,y) = m(x,y,y)$ is the second projection on B' and the first projection on $\mathbb{B}$. Moreover, h can be chosen such that $h(h(x,y),y) = h(x,y)$. By the induction hypothesis, c and $h(c,d)$ are connected by edges (and these edges are of the semilattice and majority types if they are such in $\mathbb{A}$). Let us suppose first that $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(d, h(c,d)) \neq \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(d, h(c,d))$. Then there is a term operation $g(x,y)$ of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $g(h(c,d),d) \notin \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(d, h(c,d))$. The operation $g(h(x,y),y) = y$ on B' and

$$g(h(h(c,d),d),d) = g(h(c,d),d) \in \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(d, h(c,d)),$$

a contradiction.

Since $\theta|_{\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)}$ is a maximal congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$, we may assume that $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d) = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$. The proof in this case can be completed in the same way as in Case 2.2.

CASE 2.2. The set

$$D = \{(m(c',d',d'),m(d',c',d')),(m(c',d',d'),m(d',d',c')),(m(d',d',c'),m(d',c',d')) \mid c',d' \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

generates the total congruence of $\mathbb{C}$.

If, for every pair $(g(c,d,c''),g(c,d,d''))$, where $(c'',d'') \in D$ and g is a term operation of $\mathbb{A}'$, the subalgebra $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(g(c,d,c''),g(c,d,d''))$ of $\mathbb{A}'$ is a proper subalgebra of $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$, then $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{C})$ is connected and, therefore c,d are connected by induction hypothesis. Indeed, if $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(g(c,d,c''),g(c,d,d'')) = \mathbb{C}$, then $c,d \in \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(g(c,d,c''),g(c,d,d''))$. Therefore, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(g(c,d,c''),g(c,d,d'')) = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$.

Suppose that, for a certain $(c',d') \in D$ and a ternary term operation g of $\mathbb{C}$, we have $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(g(c,d,c'),g(c,d,d')) = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$. Then, for any $e \in \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$, there is a term operation of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $h(g(c,d,c'),g(c,d,d')) = e$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $c' = m(c'',d'',d''), d' = m(d'',c'',d'')$ for certain $c'',d'' \in \mathbb{C}$. Consider $h'(x,y,z,t) = h(g(x,y,m(z,t,t)),g(x,y,m(t,z,t)))$. We have $h'|_{B'}(x,y,z,t) = g(x,y,m(z,t,t))$, hence, $h' \in F'$. On the other hand, $h'(c,d,c'',d'') = e$. Thus, $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d) = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$.

The elements c and d are connected by a path $c = e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k = d$ in $\mathcal{G}(\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d))$. Thus, it is enough to show that if $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$ is connected by edges of semilattice, majority or affine type in G, then so is $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$. Assume cd is an edge. Let θ be a maximal congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{old}}(c,d)$ witnessing that it is an edge and θ' a maximal congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)$ containing θ.

If $\mathbb{B} = \mathsf{Sg}_{\mathrm{new}}(c,d)/_{\theta'}$ is affine or 2-element we proceed in the same way as in the base case of induction. If $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{B}) \in \{\mathbf{4},\mathbf{5}\}$ then $c^{\theta'}, d^{\theta'}$ are connected by a chain of 2-element subalgebras, and the result follows from induction hypothesis.

So, suppose that $\mathsf{typ}(\mathbb{B}) = \mathbf{3}$. If $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{B})$ is connected then we are done by induction hypothesis. Otherwise we use Proposition 4. □

3.4 Unified operations

To conclude this section we prove that the polymorphisms (or term operations) certifying the strict type of edges can be significantly unifying (cf. Proposition 2 from [6]).

Theorem 7 *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an idempotent algebra. There are term operations f,g,h of $\mathbb{A}$ such that*

$f|_{\{a^{\theta_{ab}},b^{\theta_{ab}}\}}$ is a semilattice operation if ab is a strict semilattice edge, it is the first projection if ab is a strict majority or affine edge;

$g|_{\{a^{\theta_{ab}},b^{\theta_{ab}}\}}$ *is a majority operation if* ab *is a strict majority edge, it is the first projection if* ab *is a strict affine edge, and* $g|_{\{a^{\theta_{ab}},b^{\theta_{ab}}\}}(x,y,z) = f|_{\{a^{\theta_{ab}},b^{\theta_{ab}}\}}(x, f|_{\{a^{\theta_{ab}},b^{\theta_{ab}}\}}(y,z))$ *if* ab *is strict semilattice;*

$h|_{\mathsf{Sg}(ab)/\theta_{ab}}$ *is an affine operation operation if* ab *is a strict affine edge, it is the first projection if* ab *is a strict majority edge, and* $h|_{\{a^{\theta_{ab}},b^{\theta_{ab}}\}}(x,y,z) = f|_{\{a^{\theta_{ab}},b^{\theta_{ab}}\}}(x, f|_{\{a^{\theta_{ab}},b^{\theta_{ab}}\}}(y,z))$ *if* ab *is strict semilattice.*

Proof: Show first that there is an operation f that is semilattice on each semilattice edge. Let $B_1, \dots, B_n$ be the list of all semilattice edges in the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$. To avoid clumsy notation we shall denote the operation $(f/_{\theta_{ab}})|_{B_j}$, $B_j = \mathsf{Sg}(a,b)$ simply by $f|_{B_j}$. Let also $f_1, \dots, f_n$ be the list of term operations of the algebra such that $f_i|_{B_i}$ is a semilattice operation. Notice that every binary idempotent operation on a 2-element set is either a projection or a semilattice operation, and every binary operation of a module can be represented in the form $px + (1-p)y$. Since each f is idempotent, for any i, j, $f_i|_{B_j}$ is either a projection, or a semilattice operation. We prove by induction, that the operation f^i constructed via the following rules is a semilattice operation on $B_1, \dots, B_i$:

- $f^1 = f_1$;
- $f^i(x,y) = f_i(f^{i-1}(x,y), f^{i-1}(y,x))$.

The base case of induction, $i = 1$ holds by the choice of f_1. Suppose that f^{i-1} satisfies the required conditions. If $f^{i-1}|_{B_i}$ is a projection, say, $f^{i-1}|_{B_i}(x,y) = x$, then

$$f^i(x,y) = f_i(f^{i-1}(x,y), f^{i-1}(y,x)) = f_i(x,y),$$

that is a semilattice operation on B_i. Let $B_i = \{a,b\}$, and f^{i-1} a semilattice operation such that $f^{i-1}(a,b) = f^{i-1}(b,a) = a$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f^i(a,b) &= f_i(f^{i-1}(a,b), f^{i-1}(b,a)) = f_i(a,a) = a, \\ f^i(b,a) &= f_i(f^{i-1}(b,a), f^{i-1}(a,b)) = f_i(a,a) = a, \end{aligned}$$

hence, f^i is again a semilattice operation.

Thus, for each edge B, $f^n|_B$ is a semilattice operation if B is red and either a semilattice operation or a projection or $px + (1-p)y$ otherwise. However, if B is not red, then the subalgebra with the universe B has no semilattice operation, therefore, $f^n|_B$ is a projection or $px + (1-p)y$ whenever B is yellow or blue. Arguing as in the previous section, one can transform f^n such that it become a projection on blue edges. Finally, it is easy to check that $f(x,y) = f^n(f^n(x,y),x)$ satisfies the conditions of the proposition.

Now let $B_1, \dots, B_k$, $C_1, \dots, C_l$ be the lists of all yellow and all blue edges respectively, and $g_1, \dots, g_k$, $h_1, \dots, h_l$ the lists of term operations of the algebra such that $g_i|_{B_i}$ is an affine operation, and $h_i|_{C_i}$ is the minority operation. Notice first, that since neither $\mathbb{B}_i = (B_i; F|_{B_i})$ nor $\mathbb{C}_i = (C_i; F|_{C_i})$ has a term semilattice operation, every their binary term operation is either a projection or, for blue edges an operation of the form $px + (1-p)y$. Therefore, for any i, j, $g_i|_{B_j}(x,y,y), g_i|_{B_j}(y,x,y), g_i|_{B_j}(y,y,x)$, $h_i|_{B_j}(x,y,y), h_i|_{B_j}(y,x,y)$, $h_i|_{B_j}(y,y,x) \in \{x,y\}$, and $g_i|_{C_j}(x,y,y), g_i|_{C_j}(y,x,y), g_i|_{C_j}(y,y,x), h_i|_{C_j}(x,y,y)$, $h_i|_{C_j}(y,x,y), h_i|_{C_j}(y,y,x) \in \{x, y, px+(1-p)y\}$. This means that the operations $g_i|_{B_j}, h_i|_{B_j}$ are of one of the following types: a projection, the minority operation, the majority operation, a 2/3-*minority operation*, that is an operation satisfying the equalities $m(x,y,y) = y$, $m(y,x,y) = m(y,y,x) = x$ or similar.

First we prove by induction that for every $1 \le j \le k$ there is an operation $g^j(x,y,z)$ which is majority on B_i for $i \le j$. The operation $g^1 = g_1$ gives the base case of induction. Let us assume that g^{j-1} is already found. If $g^{j-1}|_{B_j}$ is the majority operation, set $g^j = g^{j-1}$. Otherwise, it is either a projection, or a 2/3-minority operation, or the minority operation. In all these case its variables can be permuted such that $g^{j-1}|_{B_j}(x,y,y) = x$. Then the operation $p(x,y) = g^{j-1}(x,y,y)$ satisfies the conditions $p|_{B_j}(x,y) = x$, and $p|_{B_i}(x,y) = y$ for all $i < j$. It is not hard to see that the operation

$$g^j(x,y,z) = p(g_j(x,y,z), g^{j-1}(x,y,z))$$

satisfies the required conditions.

Further, consider the operation g^k. Its restriction $g^k|_{C_j}$, $1 \le j \le l$, is either a projection, or the minority operation. If $g^k|_{C_j}$ is an operation $px+qy+(1-p-q)z$, then using the methods of the previous section we can derive an operation $p(x,y)$ such that $p|_{B_i}(x,y) = y$ for all $1 \le i \le k$, and $p|_{C_j}(x,y) = x$. The operation $g'(x,y,z) = p(x, g^k(x,y,z))$ is majority on B_i, $1 \le i \le k$, a projection on C_j. Therefore, $g^k|_{C_i}$ can be assumed to be a projection for all $1 \le i \le l$. Then for the operation

$$g''(x,y,z) = g^k(x, g^k(y,x,y), g^k(z,z,x))$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g''|_{B_i}(x,y,z) &= g^k|_{B_i}(x, g^k|_{B_i}(y,x,y), g^k|_{B_i}(z,z,x)) \\
&= g^k|_{B_i}(x,y,z), \quad \text{for any } 1 \le i \le k; \\
g''|_{C_i}(x,y,z) &= g^k|_{C_i}(x, g^k|_{C_i}(y,x,y), g^k|_{C_i}(z,z,x)) = x, \\
&\quad \text{for any } 1 \le i \le l \text{ such that} \\
&\quad g^k|_{C_i}(x,y,z) = x; \\
g''|_{C_i}(x,y,z) &= g^k|_{C_i}(x, g^k|_{C_i}(y,x,y), g^k|_{C_i}(z,z,x)) \\
&= g^k|_{C_i}(y,x,y) = x, \quad \text{for any } 1 \le i \le l \\
&\quad \text{such that } g^k|_{C_i}(x,y,z) = y; \\
g''|_{C_i}(x,y,z) &= g^k|_{C_i}(x, g^k|_{C_i}(y,x,y), g^k|_{C_i}(z,z,x)) \\
&= g^k|_{C_i}(z,z,x) = x, \quad \text{for any } 1 \le i \le l \\
&\quad \text{such that } g^k|_{C_i}(x,y,z) = z.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, to make g'' acting correctly on red edges we set

$$g(x,y,z) = g''(f(x,f(y,z)), f(y,f(z,x)), f(z,f(x,y))).$$

The operation g is as required.

Next we show that for any $1 \le j \le l$ there is h^j such that $h_j|_{C_i}$ is an affine operation for $i \le j$. As usual, $h^1 = h_1$ gives the base case of induction. If h^{j-1} is obtained, then if $h^{j-1}|_{C_j}$ is an affine operation then set $h^j = h^{j-1}$. Otherwise, $h^{j-1}|_{C_j} = px + qy + (1-p-q)z$. One of the coefficients is invertible, let p is invertible and $p^n = 1$. Then set

$$h'(x,y,z,t) = \underbrace{h^{j-1}(h^{j-1}(\dots h^{j-1}}_{n \text{ times}}(x,t,t),t,t\dots t,t),y,z);$$

we have $h'|_{C_j} = x + qy + (1-p-q)z + (p-1)t$ and $h'|_{C_i} = x - y + z$ for $i < j$. Furthermore, $h''(x,y,z) = h'(x,y,z,z)$: $h''|_{C_j} = x + qy - qz$, $h'|_{C_i} = x - y + z$ for $i < j$. If q is invertible then repeating the procedure above we get $h'''(x,y,z)$ which an affine operation on all the C_i, $i \le j$. Otherwise, $1+q$ is invertible, therefore, applying the same procedure to $h''(x,x,y)$ we get an operation $h'''(x,y)$ such that $h'''|_{C_j} = x$ and $h'''|_{C_i} = y$ for $i < j$. Then to obtain the required operation we set $h^j = h'''(h_j(x,y,z), h^{j-1}(x,y,z))$.

Finally, set $p(x,y) = g(x,y,y)$,

$$\overline{h}(x,y,z) = p(h^l(x,y,z), x).$$

and

$$h(x,y,z) = \overline{h}(f(x,f(y,z)), f(y,f(z,x)), f(z,f(x,y))).$$

As is easily seen h satisfies the conditions required. □

4 Thin edges

We start with an observation that operations f, g, h identified in Theorem 7 can be assumed to satisfy certain identities.

Lemma 8 *Operations f, g, h found in Theorem 7 can be chosen such that*

1. $f(x, f(x,y)) = f(x,y)$ *for all* $x, y \in \mathbb{A}$*;*
2. $g(x, g(x,y,y), g(x,y,y)) = g(x,y,y)$ *for all* $x, y \in \mathbb{A}$*;*
3. $h(h(x,y,y), y, y) = h(x,y,y)$ *for all* $x, y \in \mathbb{A}$*.*

Proof: 1. Let $f_a(x) = f(a,x)$ for $a \in \mathbb{A}$. We need to show that f can be chosen such that $f_a(f_a(x)) = f_a(x)$. Clearly, this can be done by substituting $f(x, f(x,y))$ $|\mathbb{A}|!$ times. It remains to show that every function $f_i(x,y)$ obtained inductively from $f_0(x,y) = f(x,y)$ and $f_{i+1}(x,y) = f_i(x, f(x,y))$ is a replacement for f. That is, for any semilattice edge ab, where $\theta \in \mathsf{Con}(\mathsf{Sg}(a,b))$ witnesses that ab is a semilattice edge,

$$f_{i+1}(a,b) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} f_{i+1}(b,a) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} b.$$

By induction we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i+1}(a,b) &= f_i(a, f(a,b)) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} f_i(a,b) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} b, \\ f_{i+1}(b,a) &= f_i(b, f(b,a)) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} f_i(b,b) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} b. \end{aligned}$$

2. Let g be the operation that is majority on all strict majority edges, and $g_a(x) = g(a,x,x)$. We need to show that g can be chosen such that $g_a(g_a(x)) = g_a(x)$. Clearly, this can be done by substituting $g(x, g(x,y,y), g(x,z,z))$ $|\mathbb{A}|!$ times. It remains to show that every function $g_i(x,y,z)$ obtained inductively from $g_0(x,y,z) = g(x,y,z)$ and $g'_{i+1}(x,y,z) = g_i(x, g(x,y,y), g(x,z,z))$ is a replacement for g. That is, for any strict majority edge ab, where $\theta \in \mathsf{Con}(\mathsf{Sg}(a,b))$ witnesses that ab is a majority edge,

$$g_{i+1}(a,b,b) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} g_{i+1}(b,a,b) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} g_{i+1}(b,b,a) \overset{\theta}{\equiv} b.$$

By induction we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{i+1}(a,b,b) &= g_i(a, g(a,b,b), g(a,b,b)) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} g_i(a,b,b) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} b, \\ g_{i+1}(b,a,b) &= g_i(b, m(b,a,a), g(b,b,b) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} g_i(b,a,b) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} b, \\ g_{i+1}(b,b,a) &= g_i(b, g(b,b,b), g(b,a,a)) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} g_i(b,b,a) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} b. \end{aligned}$$

3. Let $h_b(x) = h(x,b,b)$ for $b \in \mathbb{A}$. The goal is to find m such that $h_b(h_b(x)) = m_b(x)$ for all b and all x. Clearly, this can be done by substituting $h(h(x,y,y),y,z)$ $|\mathbb{A}|!$ times. It remains to show that every function $h_i(x,y,z)$ obtained inductively from $h_0(x,y,z) = h(x,y,z)$ and $h'_{i+1}(x,y,z) = h_i(h(x,y,y),y,z)$ is a replacement for h. That is, for any affine edge ab, where $\theta \in \mathsf{Con}(\mathsf{Sg}(a,b))$ witnesses that ab is an affine edge,

$$h_{i+1}(a,b,b) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} h_{i+1}(b,b,a) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} a.$$

By induction we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{i+1}(a,b,b) &= h_i(h(a,b,b),b,b) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} h_i(a,b,b) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} a, \\ h_{i+1}(b,b,a) &= h_i(h(b,b,b),b,a) = h_i(b,b,a) \stackrel{\theta}{\equiv} a. \end{aligned}$$

□

4.1 Semilattice edges

In this section we focus on (strict) semilattice edges of the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$. Note first that if one fix a term operation f such that f is a semilattice operation on every thick semilattice edge of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$, then one can define an orientation of every semilattice edge. A semilattice edge ab is oriented from a to b if $f(a^{\theta_{ab}}, b^{\theta_{ab}}) = f(b^{\theta_{ab}}, a^{\theta_{ab}}) = b^{\theta_{ab}}$. Clearly, the orientation strongly depends on the choice of the term operation f. The graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ oriented according to a term operation f will be denoted by $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbb{A})$. We then can define *semilattice-connected* and *strongly semilattice-connected* components of $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbb{A})$. We will also use the natural order on the set of strongly semilattice-connected components of $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbb{A})$: for components A, B, $A \leq B$ if there is a directed path in $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbb{A})$ consisting of semilattice edges and connecting a vertex from A with a vertex from B.

We shall now improve the choice of operation f and restrict the kind of semilattice edges we will use later. First we show that those semilattice edges ab for which θ_{ab} is not the equality relation can be thrown out of the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ such that the graph remains connected. Therefore, we can assume that every semilattice edge ab is such that f is a semilattice operation on $\{a,b\}$.

Proposition 9 *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite algebra omitting type* **1**, *f a binary term operation semilattice on every (thick) semilattice edge and such that $f(x, f(x, y)) = f(x, y)$, and $\mathcal{G}'(\mathbb{A})$ the subgraph of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ obtained by omitting semilattice edges ab such that θ_{ab} is not the equality relation. Then $\mathcal{G}'(\mathbb{A})$ is connected. Moreover, if $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ is s-connected then $\mathcal{G}'(\mathbb{A})$ is semilattice-connected. If $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ is sm-connected then $\mathcal{G}'(\mathbb{A})$ is sm-connected.*

Proof: Firstly, by Theorem 5 we may assume that every thick semilattice edge of $\mathbb{A}$ is a subalgebra. It suffices to show that for any semilattice edge ab (in $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbb{A})$), the veritces a, b are connected (s-connected or sm-connected) in $\mathcal{G}'(\mathbb{A})$. So, assume $\mathbb{A} = \mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ and ab is a semilattice edge in $\mathcal{G}_f(\mathbb{A})$. We proceed by induction on order ideals of the lattice $\mathsf{Sub}(\mathbb{A})$ of subalgebras of $\mathbb{A}$. The base case of induction, when $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ is strictly simple is obvious, because $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b) = \{a, b\}$ and there is a semilattice operation on this algebra.

Let θ be the maximal congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ witnessing that ab is an edge. Let $b' = f(a, b)$, then $f(a, b') = b' \in b^\theta$. By the induction hypothesis b' is connected (s-connected,sm-connected) with b in $\mathcal{G}'(b^\theta)$. Therefore, we may assume $f(a, b) = b$. If $\mathsf{Sg}(a, f(b, a)) \neq \mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ then we are done, because b and $f(b, a)$ are connected inside b^θ and a and $f(b, a)$ are connected inside $\mathsf{Sg}(a, f(b, a))$. Otherwise there is a term operation t such that $t(a, f(b, a)) = b$. Then, for the operation $t'(x, y) = t(x, f(y, x))$, we have

$$t'(a, b) = t(a, f(b, a)) = b,$$
$$t'(b, a) = t(b, f(a, b)) = t(b, b) = b.$$

Thus, there is a semilattice operation on $\{a, b\}$, hence $t'|_{\{a,b\}} = f|_{\{a,b\}}$. □

The graph $\mathcal{G}'(\mathbb{A})$ oriented according to a binary term operation f will be denoted by $\mathcal{G}'_f(\mathbb{A})$. Semilattice edges ab such that θ_{ab} is the equality relation will be called *thin semilattice edges*.

Using Proposition 9 we are able to impose more restrictions on the term operation f.

Proposition 10 *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite algebra omitting type* **1**. *There is a binary term operation f of $\mathbb{A}$ such that f is a semilattice operation on every thick semilattice edge of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$ and, for any $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$, either $a = f(a, b)$ or the pair $(a, f(a, b))$ is a semilattice edge of $\mathcal{G}'_f(\mathbb{A})$.*

Proof: Let f be a binary term operation such that f is semilattice on every semilattice edge and $f(x, f(x, y)) = f(x, y)$. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$ be such that $f(a, b) \neq a$, and set $b_0 = f(a, b)$ and $b_{i+1} = f(a, f(b_i, a))$ for $i > 0$.

CLAIM 1. For any i, $f(a, b_i) = b_i$.

Indeed, $f(a,b_0) = f(a,f(a,b)) = f(a,b) = b_0$, and for any $i > 0$

$$f(a,b_i) = f(a,f(a,f(b_{i-1},a))) = f(a,f(b_{i-1},a)) = b_i.$$

Let $\mathbb{B}_i = \mathsf{Sg}(a,b_i)$. Then $\mathbb{B}_0 \supseteq \mathbb{B}_1 \supseteq \ldots$, and there is k with $\mathbb{B}_{k+1} = \mathbb{B}_k$.

CLAIM 2. $f(a,b_k) = f(b_k,a) = b_k$.

Since $b_k \in \mathbb{B}_{k+1} = \mathsf{Sg}(a,b_{k+1})$, there is a term operation t such that $b_k = t(a,b_{k+1})$. Let $s(x,y) = t(x,f(x,f(y,x)))$. For this operation we have

$$\begin{aligned} s(a,b_k) &= t(a,f(a,f(b_k,a))) = t(a,b_{k+1}) = b_k \\ s(b_k,a) &= t(b_k,f(b_k,f(a,b_k))) = t(b_k,f(b_k,b_k)) = b_k. \end{aligned}$$

This means that ab is a semilattice edge, and the congruence witnessing it is the equality relation. By the choice of f, it is a semilattice operation on any such pair.

Let k be the maximal among the numbers chosen as before in Claim 2 for all pairs a,b with $f(a,b) \neq a$. Let $f_0 = f$, and $f_{i+1}(x,y) = f(x,f(f_i(x,y),x))$ for $i \geq 0$. Let also $f' = f_k$.

CLAIM 3. For any $a,b \in A$, either $f'(a,b) = a$, or the pair ac, where $c = f'(a,b)$ is a semilattice edge witnessed by the equality relation.

If $f(a,b) = a$ then it is straightforward that $f'(a,b) = a$. Suppose $f(a,b) \neq a$. We proceed by induction. Since $\mathbb{B}_k = \mathbb{B}_{k+1}$, where the $\mathbb{B}_i$ are constructed as before, by Claim 2 $f(a,c) = f(c,a) = c$. This gives the base case of induction. Suppose $f_i(a,c) = f_i(c,a) = c$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i+1}(a,c) &= f(a,f(f_i(a,c),a) = f(a,f(c,a)) = c \\ f_{i+1}(c,a) &= f(c,f(f_i(c,a),c) = f(c,f(c,c)) = c. \end{aligned}$$

Claim 3 is proved.

To complete the proof it suffices to check that f' is a semilattice operation on every (thick) semilattice edge of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{A})$. However, this is straightforward from the construction of f'. □

It will be convenient for us to denote binary operation f that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 7, Lemma 8(1), and Proposition 10 by $\cdot$, that is, to write $x \cdot y$ or just xy for $f(x,y)$. The fact that ab is a thin semilattice edge we will also denote by $a \leq b$. In other words, $a \leq b$ if and only if $ab = ba = b$.

Lemma 11 *Let ab be a thick semilattice edge, θ the congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}(a,b)$ that witnesses this, and $c \in a^\theta$. Then there is $d \in b^\theta$ such that cd is a thin semilattice edge.*

Proof: By Proposition 10 $cb = c$ or $c \leq cb$. Since $d = cb \in b^\theta$ the former option is impossible. Therefore cd is a thin semilattice edge. □

4.2 Thin majority edges

Here we introduce thin majority edges in a way similar to thin semilattice edges, although in a weaker sense.

Lemma 12 *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an algebra, ab a majority edge in it, and θ the congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}(a,b)$ witnessing that. Then there is $b' \in b^\theta$ and a ternary term operation g' of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $g'(a,b',b') = g'(b',a,b') = g'(b',b',a) = b'$.*

Check the 'strict' business

Proof: Suppose that b is such that $\mathsf{Sg}(a,b)$ is minimal among all subalgebras $\mathsf{Sg}(a,b')$ for $b' \in b^\theta$, and such that $g(a,b,b) = b$. Such an element exists by Lemma 8. Consider the ternary relation R generated by $(a,b,b),(b,a,b),(b,b,a)$. Applying g to these tuples we get $(b,b',b'') \in R$ for some $b',b'' \in b^\theta$. Since $b \in \mathsf{Sg}(a,b')$, say, $t(a,b') = b$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} b \\ b \\ b''' \end{pmatrix} = t\left(\begin{pmatrix} b \\ a \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ b' \\ b'' \end{pmatrix}\right) \in R.$$

Again, as $b \in \mathsf{Sg}(a,b''')$, using $(b,b,a),(b,b,b''') \in R$ we get $(b,b,b) \in R$. □

A majority edge satisying the conditions of Lemma 12 will be called a *thin majority edge*. More precisely, a pair ab is called a thin majority edge if (a) it is a majority edge, (b) for any $c \in b^{\theta_{ab}}$, $b \in \mathsf{Sg}(a,c)$, (c) $g(a,b,b) = b$, and (d) there exists a ternary term operation g' such that $g'(a,b,b) = g'(b,a,b) = g'(b,b,a) = b$. The operation g from Theorem 7 does not have to satisfy any specific conditions on the set $\{a,b\}$, except what follows from its definition. Also, thin majority edges are directed, since a,b in Lemma 12 occur asymmetrically.

Corollary 13 *For any strict majority edge ab, where θ is a witnessing congruence, there is $b' \in b^\theta$ such that ab' is a thin majority edge.*

We now consider the interaction of term operations on thin edges in different similar algebras.

Lemma 14 *Let $\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2, \mathbb{A}_3$ be similar idempotent algebras all omitting type* **1**. *Let a_1b_1, a_2b_2, and a_3b_3 be thin majority edges in $\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2, \mathbb{A}_3$, witnessed by congruences $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$, respectively. Then there is an operation g' such that $g'(a_1,b_1,b_1) = b_1$, $g'(b_2,a_2,b_2) = b_2$, $g'(b_3,b_3,a_3) = b_3$.*

Proof: Let R be the subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2 \times \mathbb{A}_3$ generated by (a_1,b_2,b_3), $(b_1,a_2,b_3),(b_1,b_2,a_3)$. Since a_1b_1 satisfies condition (c) of the definition of thin

majority edges,

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2' \\ b_3' \end{pmatrix} = g\left(\begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ b_2 \\ b_3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ a_2 \\ b_3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ a_3 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in R$$

and $b_2' \in b_2^{\theta_2}, b_3' \in b_3^{\theta_3}$. By condition (b) $b_2 \in \mathsf{Sg}(a_2, b_2')$, in particular, there is a term operation t such that $t(a_2, b_2') = b_2$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ b_3'' \end{pmatrix} = t\left(\begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ a_2 \\ b_3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2' \\ b_3' \end{pmatrix} \right) \in R,$$

and $b_3'' \in b_3^{\theta_3}$. Again by condition (b) $b_3 \in \mathsf{Sg}(a_3, b_3'')$, in particular, there is a term operation s such that $s(a_3, b_3'') = b_3$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ b_3 \end{pmatrix} = s\left(\begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ a_2 \\ b_3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ b_3'' \end{pmatrix} \right) \in R.$$

The result follows. □

Lemma 15 *Let $\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2$ be similar idempotent algebras all omitting type* **1**. *Let ab be a thin majority edge in $\mathbb{A}_1$, witnessed by congruences θ, and $c \leq d$ in $\mathbb{A}_2$. Then there is an binary operation t such that $t(a, b) = b$ and $t(d, c) = d$.*

Proof: Let R be the subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2$ generated by $(b, c), (a, d)$. Since ab satisfies condition (c) of the definition of thin majority edges,

$$\begin{pmatrix} b \\ d \end{pmatrix} = g\left(\begin{pmatrix} a \\ d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix} \right) \in R,$$

as g is the first projection on semilattice edges. Therefore $t(x, y) = g(x, y, y)$ satisfies the conditions. □

4.3 Thin affine edges

Lemma 16 *Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an algebra, ab an affine edge in it, and θ the congruence of $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ witnessing that. Then there is $b' \in b^\theta$ and a ternary term operation h' of $\mathbb{A}$ such that $h'(b', a, a) = h'(a, a, b') = b'$.*

Proof: Suppose a, b satisfy the conditions of the lemma. Let $b' = h(b, a, a) \in \mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$, by Lemma 8(3) $h(b', a, a) = b'$. As is easily seen, there is b' that satisfies this condition and such that for any $b'' \in b'^{\theta'}$ where θ' is the restriction of θ on $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b')$, it holds $b' \in \mathsf{Sg}(a, b'')$.

Consider relation R generated by pairs $(b', a), (a, a), (a, b')$. Since $h(b', a, a) = b'$,

$$\binom{b'}{b''} = h\left(\binom{b'}{a}, \binom{a}{a}, \binom{a}{b'}\right) \in R$$

and $b'' \in b'^{\theta'}$. By the assumption $b' \in \mathsf{Sg}(a, b'')$, in particular, $(b', b') \in R$. The result follows. □

Similar to the majority case, an affine edge satisying the conditions of Lemma 16 will be called a *thin affine edge*. More precisely, a pair ab is called a thin majority edge if (a) it is an affine edge, (b) for any $c \in b^{\theta_{ab}}$, $b \in \mathsf{Sg}(a, c)$, (c) $h(b, a, a) = b$, and (d) there exists a ternary term operation h' such that $h'(b, a, a) = h'(a, a, b) = b$. The operation h from Theorem 7 does not have to satisfy any specific conditions on the set $\{a, b\}$, except what follows from its definition. Also, thin affine edges are directed, since a, b in Lemma 16 occur asymmetrically.

Corollary 17 *For any affine edge ab, where θ is a witnessing congruence, there is $b' \in b^\theta$ such that ab' is a thin affine edge.*

Lemma 18 *Let $\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2$ be similar idempotent algebras all omitting type* **1**. *Let ab and cd be thin affine edges in $\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2$, witnessed by congruences θ_1, θ_2, respectively. Then there is an operation h' such that $h'(b, a, a) = b$ and $h'(c, c, d) = d$.*

Proof: Let R be the subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2$ generated by $(b, c), (a, c), (a, d)$. By condition (c) of the definition of thin affine edges,

$$\binom{b}{d'} = h\left(\binom{b}{c}, \binom{a}{c}, \binom{a}{d}\right) \in R$$

and $d' \in d^{\theta_2}$. By condition (b) $\mathsf{Sg}(c, d') = \mathsf{Sg}(c, d)$, in particular, $(b, d) \in R$. The result follows. □

Lemma 19 *Let $\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2$ be similar idempotent algebras all omitting type* **1**. *Let ab be a thin affine edge in $\mathbb{A}_1$, witnessed by congruences θ, and $c \leq d$ in $\mathbb{A}_2$. Then there is an operation r such that $r(b, a) = b$ and $r(c, d) = d$.*

Proof: Let R be the subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2$ generated by $(b, c), (a, d)$. By condition (c) of the definition of thin affine edges,

$$\binom{b}{d} = h\left(\binom{b}{c}, \binom{a}{d}, \binom{a}{d}\right) \in R,$$

as $h(x,y,z) = xyz$ on semilattice edges. The result follows. □

Lemma 20 *Let ab be a thin affine edge in $\mathbb{A}_1$, witnessed by congruences θ, and cd is a thin majority edge in $\mathbb{A}_2$. Then there is a binary operation t such that $t(b,a) = b$ and $t(c,d) = d$.*

Proof: Let $\mathbb{A}_1, \mathbb{A}_2$ be similar idempotent algebras all omitting type **1**. Let R be the subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}_1 \times \mathbb{A}_2$ generated by $(b,c),(a,d)$. By condition (c) of the definition of thin majority edges,

$$\begin{pmatrix} b' \\ d \end{pmatrix} = g\left(\begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a \\ d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a \\ d \end{pmatrix}\right) \in R,$$

where $b' \in b^{\theta_1}$, as g is the first projection on $\mathsf{Sg}(a,b)/_{\theta_1}$. Then as $b \in \mathsf{Sg}(a,b')$, we get $(b,d) \in R$. The result follows. □

5 Connectivity

Let $\mathbb{A}$ be an algebra omitting type **1**. A *path* in $\mathbb{A}$ is a sequence $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_k$ such that $a_{i-1}a_i$ is a thin edge for all $i \in [k]$ (note that thin edges are always assumed to be directed). We will distinguish paths of several types depending on what types of edges are allowed. If $a_{i-1} \leq a_i$ for $i \in [k]$ then the path is called a *semilattice* or *s-path*. If for every $i \in [k]$ either $a_{i-1} \leq a_i$ or $a_{i-1}a_i$ is a thin affine edge then the path is called *affine-semilattice* or *as-path*. Similarly, if only semilattice and thin majority edges are allowed we have a *semilattice-majority* or *sm-path*. We say that a is *connected* to b, $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$, if there is a path $a = a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_k = b$. If this path is semilattice (aftine-semilattice, semilattice-majority) then a is said to be *s-connected* (or *as-connected*, or *sm-connected*) to b. We denote this by $a \sqsubseteq b$ (for s-connectivity), $a \sqsubseteq_{as} b$ and $a \sqsubseteq_{sm} b$ for as- and sm-connectivity, respectively.

Let $\mathcal{G}_s''(\mathbb{A})$ denote the digraph whose nodes are the elements of $\mathbb{A}$, and the arcs are the thin semilattice edges. The strongly connected component of $\mathcal{G}_s(\mathbb{A})$ containing $a \in \mathbb{A}$ will be denoted by $\widehat{a}$. The set of strongly connected components of $\mathcal{G}_s(\mathbb{A})$ are ordered in the natural way (if $a \leq b$ then $\widehat{a} \leq \widehat{b}$), the elements belonging to maximal ones will be called *maximal*, and the set of all maximal elements from $\mathbb{A}$ by $\max(\mathbb{A})$. In a similar way we construct the graph $\mathcal{G}_{as}(\mathbb{A})$ by including all the thin semilattice and affine edges. The strongly connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{as}(\mathbb{A})$ containing $a \in \mathbb{A}$ will be denoted by $\mathsf{as}(a)$. A maximal strongly connected component of this graph is called an *as-component*, an element from an as-component is called *as-maximal*, and the set of all as-maximal elements is denoted by $\mathsf{amax}(\mathbb{A})$.

In this section we show that all maximal elements are connected to each other. The undirected connectivity easily follows from the definitions, so the challenge is to prove directed connectivity, as defined above. We start with an auxiliary lemma.

Let $R \leq \mathbb{A}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{A}_k$ be a relation. Recall that tol_i, $i \in [k]$, denotes the *link* tolerance

$$\{(a_i, a_i') \in \mathbb{A}_i^2 \mid (a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_k), \\ (a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i', a_{i+1}, \dots, a_k) \in R, \text{ for some } (a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_k)\}.$$

Lemma 21 *Let $\mathbb{A} = \mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ be simple, $a, b \in \max(\mathbb{A})$, and R a subdirect square of $\mathbb{A}$. Let also $S = \mathsf{tol}_2 R$ be the tolerance defined by $\{(c, d) \in \mathbb{A}^2 \mid (e, c), (e, d) \in R$ for some $e\}$. If S is a connected tolerance then there is a sequence $a = d_1, \dots, d_k = b'$ such that $(d_i, d_{i+1}) \in S$, d_i is maximal, $b' \in \widehat{b}$, and if a_i is such that $(a_i, d_i), (a_i, d_{i+1}) \in R$ then a_i can also be chosen maximal.*

Proof: We start with any sequence $a = d_1, \dots, d_k = b$, $(d_i, d_{i+1}) \in S$ connecting a and b. Such a sequence exists because S is a connected tolerance. We prove by induction on k. The base case of induction is obvious by the choice of a. Suppose d_i is maximal. Let $d_{i+1} = e_1 \leq \ldots \leq e_s$ be a semilattice path and e_s a maximal element. Let also $(b_j, e_j) \in R$ be extensions of the e_j and $(a_q, d_q), (a_q, d_{q+1}) \in R$ for $q \in [k-1]$. Then for each q, $i \leq q \leq k-1$, we construct the sequence $a_q = a_q^1 \leq \ldots \leq a_q^s$ and for each q, $i \leq q \leq k$, the sequence $d_q = d_q^1 \leq \ldots \leq d_q^s$, where

$$a_q^j = a_q^{j-1} \cdot b_j \qquad \text{and} \qquad d_q^j = d_q^{j-1} \cdot e_j.$$

Then observing that

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_q^1 \\ d_q^1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_q \\ d_q \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} a_q^{j+1} \\ d_q^{j+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_q^j \\ d_q^j \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} b_{j+1} \\ e_{j+1} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \text{and}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_q^1 \\ d_{q+1}^1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_q \\ d_{q+1} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} a_q^{j+1} \\ d_{q+1}^{j+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_q^j \\ d_{q+1}^j \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} b_{j+1} \\ e_{j+1} \end{pmatrix}$$

we get that $\begin{pmatrix} a_q^s \\ d_q^s \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a_q^s \\ d_{q+1}^s \end{pmatrix} \in R$ for any $i \leq q \leq n-1$. Note also that d_{i+1}^s is a maximal element. Continuing in a similar way we also can guarantee that a_q^s is a maximal element.

This process replaces d_{i+1} with a maximal element. However, d_i is also replaced with another element, and we need to restore the connection of d_i with the preceding elements. Since d_i is maximal and $d_i \sqsubseteq d_i^s$, these two elements

belong to the same maximal component. Therefore, there is a semilattice path $d_i^s = e'_1 \leq \ldots \leq e'_t = d_i$. We now proceed as before. Let $(b'_j, e'_j) \in R$ be extensions of the e'_j. Then for each q, $i \leq q \leq k-1$, we construct sequence $a_q^s = p_q^1 \leq \ldots \leq p_q^t$ and for each q, $i \leq q \leq k$, sequence $d_q^s = r_q^1 \leq \ldots \leq r_q^t$, where

$$p_q^j = p_q^{j-1} \cdot b'_j \qquad \text{and} \qquad r_q^j = r_q^{j-1} \cdot e'_j.$$

Then observing that

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_q^1 \\ r_q^1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_q^s \\ d_q^s \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} p_q^{j+1} \\ r_q^{j+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p_q^j \\ r_q^j \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} b'_{j-1} \\ e'_{j-1} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \text{and}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_q^1 \\ r_{q+1}^1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p_q \\ r_{q+1} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} p_q^{j+1} \\ r_{q+1}^{j+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p_q^j \\ r_{q+1}^j \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} b'_{j-1} \\ e'_{j-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

we get that $\begin{pmatrix} p_q^t \\ r_q^t \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} p_q^t \\ r_{q+1}^t \end{pmatrix} \in R$ for any $i \leq q \leq n-1$. Note also that $r_i^t = d_i$, r_{i+1}^t is a maximal element, and r_n^t belongs to the same maximal component as b. □

Proposition 22 *Let $a, b \in \max(\mathbb{A})$. Then a is connected to b.*

Proof: We prove the proposition by induction on the size of $\mathbb{A}$ through a sequence of claims.

CLAIM 1. $\mathbb{A}$ can be assumed to be $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$.

If $a, b \in \max(\mathbb{B})$, $\mathbb{B} = \mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$, then we are done by the induction hypothesis. Suppose they are not and let $c, d \in \max(\mathbb{B})$ be such that $a \sqsubseteq c$ and $b \sqsubseteq d$. By the induction hypothesis c is connected to d. As $a \sqsubseteq c$, a is connected to c. It remains to show that d is connected to b. This, however, follows straightforwardly from the assumption that b is maximal, and therefore $d \in \widehat{b}$, and so $d \sqsubseteq b$ in $\mathbb{A}$.

CLAIM 2. $\mathbb{A}$ can be assumed simple.

Suppose $\mathbb{A}$ is not simple and α is its maximal congruence. Let $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{A}/_\alpha$. By the induction hypothesis a^α is connected to b^α, that is, there is a sequence $a^\alpha = \overline{a}_0, \overline{a}_1, \ldots, \overline{a}_k = b^\alpha$ such that $\overline{a}_i \leq \overline{a}_{i+1}$ or $\overline{a}_i \overline{a}_{i+1}$ is a thin affine or majority edge in $\mathbb{B}$. We will choose some $a_i \in \max(\overline{a}_i)$, where $\overline{a}_i$ is viewed as a subalgebra of $\mathbb{A}$, such that a_i is connected to a_{i+1} in $\mathbb{A}$. Set $a_1 = a$.

Depending on whether $\overline{a}_i \overline{a}_{i+1}$ is a semilattice, affine, or majority edge, use Lemma 11, 16, or 12 to choose $a_{i+1} \in \overline{a}_{i+1}$ such that $a_i a_{i+1}$ is a thin edge.

It remains to show that a_k is connected to b. Since b is maximal, it suffices to take elements a', b' maximal in b^α and such that $a_k \sqsubseteq a'$ and $b \sqsubseteq b'$. Then a_k is connected to b' by the induction hypothesis, and b' is connected to b in $\mathbb{A}$, as $b' \in \widehat{b}$.

CLAIM 3. $\mathsf{Sg}(a,b)$ can be assumed equal to $\mathsf{Sg}(a',b')$ for any $a' \in \widehat{a}$, $b' \in \widehat{b}$.

If $\mathsf{Sg}(a',b') \subset \mathsf{Sg}(a,b)$ for some $a' \in \widehat{a}$, $b' \in \widehat{b}$, then by the induction hypothesis a'' is connected to b'' for some $a'' \in \widehat{a}$, $b'' \in \widehat{b}$. Therefore a is also connected to b.

Let R be the binary relation generated by (a,b) and (b,a). We consider two cases.

CASE 1. R is not the graph of a mapping, or, in other words, there is no automorphism of $\mathbb{A}$ that maps a to b and b to a.

Consider the tolerance $Q = \mathsf{tol}_1 R = \{(c,d) \in \mathbb{A}^2 \mid \text{there is } e \text{ with } (c,e),(d,e) \in R\}$ induced by R on $\mathbb{A}$. Since $\mathbb{A}$ is simple and R is not the graph of a mapping, Q is a connected tolerance. There are again two options.

SUBCASE 1A. For every $e \in \mathbb{A}$ the set $B_e = \{d \mid (d,e) \in R\} \neq \mathbb{A}$.

There are $e_1, \dots, e_k \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $a \in B_{e_1}$, $b \in B_{e_k}$, and $B_{e_i} \cap B_{e_{i+1}} \neq \varnothing$ for every $i \in [k-1]$. By Lemma 21 the e_i's can be chosen maximal, and therefore for every $i \in [k-1]$ we can choose $d_i \in B_i \cap B_{i+1}$ which is maximal in $\mathbb{A}$. For each $i \in [k-1]$ choose $c, d \in \max(B_i)$ with $d_{i-1} \sqsubseteq c$ and $d_i \sqsubseteq d$. By the induction hypothesis c is connected to d. Then clearly d_{i-1} is connected to c, and, as d_i is maximal and $d \in \widehat{d_i}$, d is connected to d_i.

SUBCASE 1B. There is $e \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $\mathbb{A} \times \{e\} \subseteq R$.

By Lemma 21 there are $a' \in \widehat{a}$, $b' \in \widehat{b}$, and a maximal element e' such that $(a',e'),(b',e') \in R$. Since $\mathbb{A} = \mathsf{Sg}(a',b')$, we have $\mathbb{A} \times \{e'\} \subseteq R$. Thus, e can be assumed maximal. We have therefore $(a,b),(a,e),(b,e),(b,a) \in R$. If both $\mathsf{Sg}(b,e)$ and $\mathsf{Sg}(e,a)$ are proper subalgebras of $\mathbb{A}$, then proceed as in Subcase 1a. Otherwise suppose $\mathsf{Sg}(b,e) = \mathbb{A}$. This means $\{a\} \times \mathbb{A} \subseteq R$, and, in particular, $(a,a) \in R$. Therefore there is a binary term operation f such that $f(a,b) = f(b,a) = a$, that is $b \leq a$. Since both elements are maximal, $b \in \widehat{a}$, implying they are connected.

CASE 2. R is the graph of a mapping, or, in other words, there is an automorphism of $\mathbb{A}$ that maps a to b and b to a.

There are two cases to consider.

SUBCASE 2A. There is no nonmaximal element $c \leq a'$ or $c \leq b'$ for any $a' \in \widehat{a}$, $b' \in \widehat{b}$.

If there is a maximal d such that $d' \leq d$ for some nonmaximal $d' \in \mathbb{A}$ (that is, $\mathbb{A} \neq \max(\mathbb{A})$), then by Case 1 and Subcase 2b a is connected to d and d is connected to b. Suppose all elements in $\mathbb{A}$ are maximal. By Theorem 1 and Proposition 9 there are $a = a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k = b$ such that for any $i \in [k-1]$ either $a_i a_{i+1}$ is an affine or majority edge (not a thin edge), or $a_i \leq a_{i+1}$, or $a_{i+1} \leq a_i$.

In the latter two cases $a_{i+1} \in \widehat{a_i}$, and therefore there is a semilattice path from a_i to a_{i+1}. We need to show that if $a_i a_{i+1}$ is an affine or majority edge then a_i is connected to a_{i+1}. Let θ be a congruence of $\mathbb{B} = \mathsf{Sg}(a_i, a_{i+1})$ witnessing that $a_i a_{i+1}$ is an affine or majority edge. By Lemmas 12 and 16 there is $b \in a_{i+1}^{\theta}$ such that $a_i b$ is a thin edge. Then take $c, d \in \max(\mathbb{B})$ such that $b \sqsubseteq c$ and $a_{i+1} \sqsubseteq d$. By the induction hypothesis c is connected to d. Finally, as all elements in $\mathbb{A}$ are maximal, d is connected with a_{i+1} in $\mathbb{A}$ with a semilattice path.

SUBCASE 2B. There is a nonmaximal element c with $c \leq a'$ or $c \leq b'$ for some $a' \in \widehat{a}$ or $b' \in \widehat{b}$. In particular, this happens whenever there is a nonmaximal element c with $c \sqsubseteq a$ or $c \sqsubseteq b$.

Note first that we may assume that, for any $b' \in \widehat{b}$, there is an automorphism that sends b' to a and a to b', as otherwise we are in the conditions of Case 1. Recall that we also assume $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b') = \mathbb{A}$. Because of this and the automorphism swapping a and b, without loss of generality we may assume that there is nonmaximal $c \leq b$. Consider $\mathsf{Sg}(a, c)$.

If $\mathsf{Sg}(a, c) = \mathbb{A}$, consider the relation Q generated by $(a, c), (c, a)$. Since c is not maximal, Q cannot be the graph of an automorphism. Therefore Q induces a nontrivial tolerance on $\mathbb{A}$ that, in particular, connects a and b, and we either complete as in Case 1, or show that $c \leq a$, which is a contradiction, as $\mathsf{Sg}(a, c) = \{a, c\}$ in this case.

If $\mathbb{B} = \mathsf{Sg}(a, c) \neq \mathbb{A}$, take $d \in \max(\mathbb{B})$ and such that $c \sqsubseteq d$. By the induction hypothesis a is connected to d. Now let $d \sqsubseteq d'$ such that $d' \in \max(\mathbb{A})$. It remains to show that d' is connected to b. If $\mathsf{Sg}(d', b) \neq \mathbb{A}$, the result follows by the induction hypothesis. If there is no automorphism that swaps d' and b, we argue as in Case 1. So, let $\mathsf{Sg}(d', b) = \mathbb{A}$ and there is an automorphism swapping d' and b.

Elements a, b are said to be *v-connected* if there is $c \in \mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ such that $c \sqsubseteq a$ and $c \sqsubseteq b$. The result follows from the next statement.

CLAIM 4. If a, b are v-connected and there is an automorphism of $\mathbb{A}$ that swaps a and b, then they are connected.

Let $c \sqsubseteq d$. The *s-distance* from c to d is the length of the shortest semilattice path from c to d. The s-distance from c to $\widehat{d}$ is the shortest s-distance from c to an element from $\widehat{d}$. The *depth* of an element c is the greatest s-distance to a maximal component, denoted $\mathsf{dep}(c)$. We prove the Claim by induction on the size of $\mathsf{Sg}(a, b)$ and $\mathsf{dep}(c)$, provided $c \sqsubseteq a$, $c \sqsubseteq b$.

If $c \leq a$, $c \leq b$, in particular, if $\mathsf{dep}(c) = 1$, then there is a binary term operation f such that $f(a, b) = c$. Let $d = f(b, a)$. Since there is an automorphism swapping a and b, $d \leq a$ and $d \leq b$. Set $g(x, y, z) = (f(y, x) \cdot f(y, z)) \cdot f(x, z)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} g(a,a,b) &= (ac)c = a, \\ g(a,b,a) &= (dd)a = a \\ g(b,a,a) &= (ca)d = a. \end{aligned}$$

Since a and b are automorphic, g is a majority operation on $\{a, b\}$. Therefore, a and b are connected.

Suppose the Claim is proved for all algebras and pairs of elements v-connected through an element of depth less than $\mathsf{dep}(c)$. Let $c = a_1 \leq a_2 \leq a_k = a$ and $c = b_1 \leq b_2 \leq \ldots \leq b_m = b$, and $k > 2$ or $m > 2$. We may assume b_{m-1} is a nonmaximal element and consider $B = \mathsf{Sg}(a, b_{m-1})$. As in Case 1a if $B = \mathbb{A}$ then there is no automorphism swapping a and b_{m-1}. Then we consider relation Q generated by $(a, b_{m-1}), (b_{m-1}, a)$. We can show that a and b are connected in this case.

Suppose $B \neq \mathbb{A}$. Let $d \in \max(B)$ be such that $b_{m-1} \prec d$, let also $e \in \max(\mathbb{A})$ be such that $d \prec e$. By the induction hypothesis a is connected to d, and therefore to e. Also, e and b are v-connected through b_{m-1}, and $\mathsf{dep}(b_{m-1}) < \mathsf{dep}(c)$. If $\mathsf{Sg}(e, b) \neq \mathbb{A}$, we conclude by the induction hypothesis of the proposition. If $\mathsf{Sg}(e, b) = \mathbb{A}$, by the induction hypothesis of Claim 4, e is connected to b. □

References

[1] Libor Barto. The dichotomy for conservative constraint satisfaction problems revisited. In *LICS*, pages 301–310, 2011.

[2] Libor Barto. The constraint satisfaction problem and universal algebra. *The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, 21(3):319–337, 2015.

[3] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Absorbing subalgebras, cyclic terms, and the constraint satisfaction problem. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 8(1), 2012.

[4] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Constraint satisfaction problems solvable by local consistency methods. *J. ACM*, 61(1):3:1–3:19, 2014.

[5] Libor Barto, Marcin Kozik, and Ross Willard. Near unanimity constraints have bounded pathwidth duality. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2012, Dubrovnik, Croatia, June 25-28, 2012*, pages 125–134, 2012.

[6] Andrei A. Bulatov. Tractable conservative constraint satisfaction problems. In *18th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2003), 22-25 June 2003, Ottawa, Canada, Proceedings*, page 321, 2003.

[7] Andrei A. Bulatov. A graph of a relational structure and constraint satisfaction problems. In *LICS*, pages 448–457, 2004.

[8] Andrei A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for constraint satisfaction problems on a 3-element set. *J. ACM*, 53(1):66–120, 2006.

[9] Andrei A. Bulatov. Bounded relational width. available at `https://www.cs.sfu.ca/ abulatov/papers/relwidth.pdf`, 2009.

[10] Andrei A. Bulatov. Complexity of conservative constraint satisfaction problems. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 12(4):24, 2011.

[11] Andrei A. Bulatov. On the CSP dichotomy conjecture. In *Computer Science - Theory and Applications - 6th International Computer Science Symposium in Russia, CSR 2011, St. Petersburg, Russia, June 14-18, 2011. Proceedings*, pages 331–344, 2011.

[12] Andrei A. Bulatov. Conservative constraint satisfaction re-revisited. *CoRR*, abs/1408.3690, 2014.

[13] Andrei A. Bulatov. Conservative constraint satisfaction re-revisited. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 82(2):347–356, 2016.

[14] Andrei A. Bulatov and Víctor Dalmau. A simple algorithm for mal'tsev constraints. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(1):16–27, 2006.

[15] Andrei A. Bulatov, Peter Jeavons, and Andrei A. Krokhin. Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 34(3):720–742, 2005.

[16] Andrei A. Bulatov and Matthew Valeriote. Recent results on the algebraic approach to the CSP. In *Complexity of Constraints - An Overview of Current Research Themes [Result of a Dagstuhl Seminar]*., pages 68–92, 2008.

[17] S. Burris and H.P. Sankappanavar. *A course in universal algebra*, volume 78 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1981.

[18] D. Hobby and R.N. McKenzie. *The Structure of Finite Algebras*, volume 76 of *Contemporary Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1988.

[19] Pawel M. Idziak, Petar Markovic, Ralph McKenzie, Matthew Valeriote, and Ross Willard. Tractability and learnability arising from algebras with few subpowers. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(7):3023–3037, 2010.

[20] Peter Jeavons, David A. Cohen, and Marc Gyssens. Closure properties of constraints. *J. ACM*, 44(4):527–548, 1997.

[21] K. Kearnes. Idempotent simple algebras. In *Logic and algebra (Pontignano, 1994)*, volume 180 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 529–572. Dekker, New York, 1996.

[22] R.N. McKenzie, G. McNulty, and W. Taylor. *Algebras, Lattices, Varieties, I*. Wadsworth–Brooks/Cole, Monterey, California, 1987.

[23] A. Szendrei. Simple surjective algebras having no proper subalgebras. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society (Series A)*, 48:434–454, 1990.